

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the pending Office Action mailed on February 22, 2010. Because this Response is accompanied by a certificate of electronic filing in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on or before the shortened period for reply set to expire on **May 22, 2010**, this Response is timely filed.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Prior to this Response, claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 29 were pending and at issue. By this Response, claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended, none of the pending claims have been canceled, and new claims 30 to 35 have been added to clarify the subject matter for which protection is sought. Thus, claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 35 are pending and at issue.

The new claims have been added to ensure clarity and consistency, and not to address any pending rejection or other statutory deficiency. New claims 30 to 35 are fully supported by the originally filed specification as shown in paragraphs [0049] to [0053] of the published application (US 2005/0232166).

The total fees believed due in connection with this Response are \$312.00, however, please charge **Deposit Account No. 23-1925 (11828.00004)** for any fees deemed owed.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS

The Office Action rejects: claims 1 to 5, 7, 8, 11 to 17, 19, 21, 23 to 25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,412,040 to Koch ("Koch") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004-0267527 to Creamer et al. ("Creamer"); and claims 9, 10, 18, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Koch* in view of *Creamer* and further in view of *Saidon* and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004-0086100 to Moore et al. ("Moore"); and claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Koch* in view of *Creamer* and further in view of *Saidon* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,007,098 to Smyth et al. ("Smyth").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 29 as obvious over *Koch* in view of *Creamer* and further in view of *Saidon* with or without

Moore and Smyth. In order to further clarify the claimed subject matter, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the conversion program is configured to utilize aiding data to enhance the conversion of the first conference-endpoint data. Similarly, Claim 21 recites that the preparation of converted first-endpoint data utilizes aiding data to enhance the conversion of the first conference-endpoint data.

One benefit of utilizing aiding data in conjunction with the conversion program is that the voice recognition success rate or accuracy may be enhanced. Moreover, and as further recited in claims 30 to 35, the aiding data may be associated with a participant at the first endpoint to allow the conversion program to learn or improve future speech-to-text recognition.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggest utilizing aiding data in connection with the conversion program in order to enhance the accuracy of the conversion as recited by independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Furthermore, none of the cited references discloses or suggests that the aiding data includes or utilizes aiding data having a dictionary of common vocabulary much less an identifier associated with the participant at the first endpoint.

Because each of the cited references fails to disclose, either alone or in combination with the remaining references, each and every element recited by claims at issue, any combination based on those references would likewise fail to disclose each and every element. Thus, the relied upon references cannot provide the basis upon which a *prima facie* case of obviousness may be established. For at least these reasons, Applicant submit that claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 35 are patentable over any combination of *Koch, Creamer, Saidon, Moore and Smyth*.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and submits that the above-identified patent application is now in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits reconsideration of same. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting prosecution of this application.

APPL. No. 10/823,901
RESP. DATED MAY 13, 2010
RESP. TO OFFICE ACTION OF FEBRUARY 22, 2010

ATTY. DOCKET No.: 2003P18698US

Respectfully submitted,
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

Dated: **May 13, 2010**

BY: /Matthew T. Ridsdale/
Matthew T. Ridsdale
Reg. No. 56,832
Cust. No. **28524**
Direct: (312) 245-5311
mridsdale@brinkshofer.com